

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

GENEVA HOLMES-JAMES,

Plaintiff,

v.

KING COUNTY COURT, *et al.*,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C17-0321RSL

ORDER REQUIRING MORE
DEFINITE STATEMENT

On March 22, 2017, plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* was granted and her complaint was accepted for filing. The nature of plaintiff's claim or claims is difficult to discern, however. It appears that plaintiff was denied counsel in a previous lawsuit aimed at (a) defending against a government lien, (b) seeking custody of her children, and/or (c) recovering property held by various California banks. She identifies three defendants (two of whom appear to be judicial officers), but mentions only one of them in her statement of claim. Plaintiff may be seeking damages for the failure to appoint counsel in the earlier lawsuit or she may be requesting assistance in this case so that she can pursue one or all of those matters here.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Although a complaint need not provide detailed factual allegations, it must give rise to something more than mere

1 speculation that plaintiff has a right to relief. Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544,
2 555 (2007). The Court has reviewed the pleading under the standards articulated in 28
3 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and finds that plaintiff has not met her burden. Plaintiff has not
4 alleged any facts raising a plausible inference that the judicial officers, who are entitled
5 to absolute immunity from suits related to actions taken in their judicial capacity, could
6 be held liable in this action. Miller v. Davis, 521 F.3d 1142, 1145 (9th Cir. 2008)
7 (quoting Bradley v. Fisher, 80 U.S. (13 Wall.) 335, 347 (1871)). Nor is the Court able to
8 decipher a cognizable claim against Lonnie C. Gulley. Plaintiff alleges that her property,
9 including wills, titles and deeds to buildings, and “\$100,000,000,000.00 plus a five
10 dollar, 10 dollar, twentie dollars, 1 dollar, and one was okayed by the court’s to Lonnie
11 C. Gulley”. Dkt. # 6 at 3. Receiving an award of damages or property at the direction of
12 the court does not suggest wrongdoing or liability: additional facts would be needed to
13 present a plausible claim for relief against this defendant.¹

14
15 For all of the foregoing reasons, the Court declines to issue summons in this
16 matter. Plaintiff is hereby ORDERED to file on or before **May 4, 2017**, an amended
17 complaint which clearly and concisely identifies the acts of which each defendant is
18 accused, how those acts violated plaintiff’s legal rights, and the relief requested. The key
19 to filing an acceptable amended complaint will be providing enough facts that one could
20 conclude that plaintiff has a right to relief that is as least plausible. The amended
21 complaint will replace the existing complaint in its entirety. Failure to timely file an
22

23 ¹ The Court notes that, to the extent plaintiff is attempting to relitigate the validity of a
24 government lien, she has not alleged facts showing that this Court has jurisdiction over what
25 appears to be a claim by the state. To the extent plaintiff is challenging a child custody
26 determination, that issue falls squarely within the domestic relations exception to federal
diversity jurisdiction. Thompson v. Thompson, 798 F.2d 1547, 1558 (9th Cir. 1986); Atwood
v. Fort Peck Tribal Court Assiniboine, 513 F.3d 943, 947 (9th Cir. 2008). Finally, any claim by
this California resident against the banking institutions of California would not trigger federal
jurisdiction, as there is no indication of a federal question or diversity of citizenship.

1 amended complaint that asserts a plausible claim for relief will result in dismissal of this
2 action.

3
4 The Clerk of Court is directed to place this Order Requiring More Definite
5 Statement on the Court's calendar for consideration on Friday, May 5, 2017.

6
7 Dated this 31st day of March, 2017.

8 

9 Robert S. Lasnik
United States District Judge